DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 267 804 IR 051 465

TITLE	The NABRIN Report. Report of the National Advisory Board on Rural Information Needs Planning Committee.
INSTITUTION	National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, Washington, D. C.
PUB DATE	17 Apr 85
NOTE	36p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Advisory Committees; *Federal Programs; History; *Information Needs; Information Networks; *Library Cooperation; Long Range Planning; *National Programs; Program Descriptions; *Rural Areas
IDENTIFIERS	*National Advisory Board Rural Information Needs

ABSTRACT

This report begins with an executive summary and an introduction; the introduction provides a brief statement about the innovative process which led to the proposal to establish a National Advisory Board on Rural Information Needs (NABRIN) in the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA). A background statement gives an overview of the many problems in rural America and how the information age is passing it by. It concludes with a list of 11 important information imperatives for rural America. Cooperative national planning to meet rural information needs is discussed in some detail, with the emphasis on the four years of effort by the commission to focus national attention on the information needs of the nation's rural areas, and how this effort led to the proposal to establish NABRIN. The heart of the report is the proposed charter for NABRIN, which would establish a 20-member commission in the USDA to advise and assist the Secretary of Agriculture in focusing national attention on rural information needs, and in the development of policies, strategies, and action programs responsive to these needs. Lists of the planning committee and commission members are included. Appendices include a list of members of the planning board for NABRIN; a roster of commissioners; the resolution establishing the NABRIN planning committee; significant portions from Public Law 91-345; and Chapter 55 of the Code of Federal Regulations: "U.S. Department Of Agriculture." (THC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OERI
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official position or policy.

ED267804

THE NABRIN REPORT

Report of the National Advisory Board on Rural Information Needs
Planning Committee

April 17, 1985

IR051465

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
NCLIS
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Table of Contents

Executive Summary ---------- pages i-ii

Introduction ---------- pages 1-2

Background ---------- pages 3-11

Cooperative Planning ---------- pages 12-15

Charter ---------- pages 16-21

Planning Committee ---------- page 22

Commission Members ---------- page 23

List of Appendices

Members NABRIN Planning Board ---------- page I

Roster of Commissioners ---------- page II

Resolution Establishing NABRIN Planning Committee ---- page III

Public Law 91-345 ---------- page IV-V

"U.S. Department of Agriculture", Chapter 55, ---------- page VI-IX
Code of Federal Regulations

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The NABRIN planning committee was convened by NCLIS early in 1984 to "examine and evaluate the concept of a National Advisory Board on Rural Information Needs, [and] determine if there is a need for such a board and what its purpose would be, provided the U.S. Department of Agriculture supports this effort." Agreement to participate in the planning committee study was quickly obtained from the Office of the Secretary, U.S.D.A. The fifteen-person committee represented a balance of interests from concerned U.S.D.A agencies, the Commission, and the library and information communities was appointed by the Commission. The committee was chaired by the program officer for NCLIS's National Rural Library and Information Services Development Program; the vice chairperson was the Special Assistant to U.S.D.A.'s Assistant Secretary for Administration. The NABRIN planning committee met regularly throughout 1984 and early 1985 at U.S.D.A.

At its second meeting, the planning committee considered three basic questions: (1) is the issue of inadequate rural information services important enough to take nationwide action to bring about change and improvement; (2)is there a need for improved information services in rural areas, and would greater accessibility to such services have enough of a positive economic and social impact on rural areas to warrant extraordinary effort to correct the situation; and (3) would a high level National Advisory Board on Rural Information Needs (NABRIN) be prestigious enough to cause the private and public sector information providers and utilities to recognize and respond to the information needs of rural citizens and communities. Committee consensus was that the issues were important enough to pursue the idea of a high level board which would focus national attention on the information needs of rural America.

The committee determined that despite the vast informational resources available and the many existing networks and delivery systems now in place, most of rural America is not able to obtain the kinds of information necessary for local community officials in rural areas to govern these communities well. The lack of strong libraries and other informational resources in rural areas also inhibits or limits their ability to attract important new revenue-producing resources, businesses and institutions. Adequate health care, legal services, schools, family services and a host of other essential services depend on adequate information resources. An increasing number of responsible observers, including rural sociologists, political scientists, librarians, economists, local government officials and others are writing and testifying that despite the new information and telecommunications technologies, the information gap between rural and urban communities is widening rather than decreasing. Although the content costs of information and data bases are still declining,

the higher costs that seem to be associated with large scale telecommunications services more than offset the low cost of the information and data that could be used by the rural consumer.

THE NABRIN REPORT AND THE NABRIN CHARTER

The report consists of four main parts: introduction, background, cooperative planning, and the proposed NABRIN charter. Two items in the List of Appendices are particularly important: Public Law 91-345, and "U.S. Department of Agriculture," Chapter 55, Code of Federal Regulations. For the convenience of the reader, only those parts of both laws that apply directly to a proposed NABRIN are shown.

1. Introduction: The introduction is a very brief statement about the innovative process which led to the proposal to establish a National Advisory Board on Rural Information Needs in the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

2. Background: The background statement gives an overview of the many problems of rural America and how the information age is passing it by. It finishes with a list of eleven important informational imperatives for rural America.

3. Cooperative National Planning to Meet Rural Information Needs. This section discusses in some detail the four years of effort by the Commission to focus national attention the information needs of the nation's rural areas, and how this effort has led to the proposal to establish a National Advisory Board on Rural Information Needs in U.S.D.A.

4. Charter: The proposed charter for NABRIN is the heart of the report. It would establish a twenty member NABRIN in U.S.D.A. to advise and assist the Secretary of Agriculture in focusing national attention on rural information needs, and in the development of policies, strategies and action programs that will be responsive to these needs.

INTRODUCTION

Numerous investigations of the innovative process have shown that it takes from five to ten years for an innovation to become established in our society. While it has taken little more than one year to produce this report from the National Advisory Board on Rural Information Needs (NABRIN) Planning Committee, six years of effort consisting of persuasion, argumentation, coalition building, cooperation, and collaboration were consumed in laying the groundwork. This is not to say that an advisory board on rural information needs was foreseen in 1978, although the chain of events, program planning and activities, that have led to this report, began in that year.

In 1978, the National Agricultural Library submitted to the White House an "Innovative Initiative to Focus Useful Scientific, Technical, and Social Information to the Small Businessman, the Farmer, and Local Community Groups." This initiative was written in support of two White House Conferences scheduled within a three month period: The White House Conference on Libraries and Information Services, November 15-20, 1979, and the White House Conference on Small Business, January 13-17, 1980.

The major objectives of this initiative were twofold: (1) assure the accessibility and use of beneficial information by all constituencies of USDA, including the small businessman, and (2) strengthen or revitalize the community library or local library system as information centers.

The innovative process is not the same as the creative process, however. It can be an old idea that is new to the adopting institution(s.) It frequently results from either reordering, restructuring, or combining the goals and objectives of existing institutions into new formal structures or cooperative ventures. Frequently existing elements and procedures of the existing institutions are adopted by two or more institutions without significant loss of autonomy by any one of them.

Instrumental to the innovative process described in this report were the contributions of a great number of people who represented one or more of the following agencies or organizations: American Library Association; American Society for Information Science; Center for the Study of Rural Librarianship, Clarion University of Pennsylvania; Chief Officers of State Library Agencies; Congressional Research Service; Information Industry Association; Intermountain Community Learning and Information Service Project; National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges; National Commission on Libraries and Information Science; National Technical

Information Service; Public Library Association, Committee on Rural Library Services; Pioneer Public TV, Appleton, Minnesota; United States Department of Agriculture--Office of the Secretary, Cooperative Extension Service, National Agricultural Library, Office of Rural Development Policy; and, Utah State University.

Gerald J. Sophar
Chairperson,
Planning Committee

I. BACKGROUND

We live in a remarkable society. Coexisting in the same ecosystem are extreme differences. On one hand, we point with deserved pride to the accomplishments of technology--the Space Shuttle, microprocessing, telecommunications--are only a few of these distinct achievements. Linerally, we must observe, however, the opposite end of the spectrum. Poverty, social anomie, despair, etc., remind us of enduring unmet challenges within our fragile human framework. We are also cognizant of the fact that our perceptions about ourselves and our world are conditioned by unrelenting change. Causing this change and likewise symptomatic of it is a phenomenon of dynamic and unyielding proportions--information as an ever expanding and nonconsumable product. "Information is a resource of immense economic and social value. It is vital to the proper functioning of a democratic society, a crucial tool in a productive economy and an effective government, a central part of the growth and well being of individuals."[1]

Pi-Sheng and Gutenberg changed our world because of providing the facility of replicating information through the use of moveable type. Computer technology, at its current level, provides an ability to store, organize, and disseminate information at an unbelievable and potentially incomprehensible rate. Added to

---

[1]U. S. National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. Public Sector/Private Sector Interaction in Providing Information Services. (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1982), p. vii.

this is all of the information in graphic, tactile, and textual forms which may be found in American libraries and museums. In a real sense, we have become a society in which we are both consumer of and consumed by information. At a practical level, therefore, conceptualizing and being able to deal with information is a problem of the greatest proportions in the United States. While information may be conceived of as amorphous and anonymous, it provides the intellectual and economic power of survival.

Because of the cultural and economic differences which comprise the United States, access to information is disproportionately available to its citizenry. Unfortunately, the cliche of "the rich get richer and the poor get poorer" has a validity in relation to information access. Technology has the potential to mitigate real or imagined economic boundaries. At the present, however, information technology augments already established resource centers, and these tend to be located in the metropolitan areas of the United States. As a consequence of this natural tendency, rural America shares unfavorably in the "information pie." The purpose of this document, therefore, is to posit a cooperative thrust which combines the talents of government and of the private and public sectors to respond to the critical needs of information access and use in the rural countryside.

Ironically, the need to consider the infrastructure of information in nonmetropolitan America has never been greater. For the first time in the history of the United States, more people are moving to rural areas than metropolitan places. During the period of

1970-1980, the rural population of the United States grew by 16%, while metropolitan growth was charted at ten percent.[2] In reality, the nonmetropolitan growth was even larger but hidden because of the effect of the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA,) which classifies the population of an entire county as urban regardless of the characteristics of the individual towns or townships which it comprises. In 1980, the SMSA was changed to a Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA,) which adds the tests of population growth, density, travel to work, etc., for defining urban places. Because of the 1980 definition, e.g., 49 previously named metropolitan counties have been reclassified as rural. But 38 new areas have been listed as MSA's that contain large number of rural people.[3] Presently, 85 million people live in 45,000 rural communities, 35 percent of which are incorporated cities.[4] While there is currently some suggestion that the rural migration has slowed, there is no indication of permanent population decline.

A complex number of reasons account for the "rebirth" of rural America. Interstate highway systems, population mobility, an expanding service economy, the availability and growth of institutions of higher education, the movement of job opportunities into the

---

[2]U. S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Development Division, Economic Research Service. Chartbook of Nonmetro-Metro Trends. (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, Rural Development Research Report, Number 43, 1984), p. 4.

[3]Calvin Beale, "New Definitions for Metropolitan Areas," Rural Development Perspectives. Volume 1, Issue 1 (October, 1984), p. 20.

[4]J. Norman Reid and Patrick J. Sullivan, "Rural Infrastructure: How Much? How Good?" Rural Development Perpspectives. Volume 1, Issue 1 (October, 1984), p. 10.

countryside, etc., are causal considerations. There is also some suggestion, while rural America has become decidely less agrarian since its founding, that renewed interest in farming is also a mitigating factor in augmenting rural population growth. Over the last several years, for instance, there has been a 17% increase in the number of small farms in the United States.[5]

Another factor must be added to those above to further explain why there has been a reversal of the traditional rural to urban exodus. Simply put, but difficult to completely analyze, Americans are looking for a "better way of life." The real and imagined values of small town living have created an appealing sociology in which the new rural people hope to participate. Meaningful interpersonal relationships, safe places, clean air and water, the back yard garden, close proximity to recreational areas, etc., are all part of this new rural mentality. Small town America has also encouraged the older American to remain in his or her community rather than seeking health related services traditionally characteristic of metropolitan areas. Consequently, the countryside is presently "older" than urban places. In a real sense, we are witnessing a new melting pot at work in rural America.

As our country had to adjust its institutions to the waves of immigrants in the 19th and 20th centuries, in microcosm, the same challenges exist for the rural towns and townships which are faced with new and accelerated demands for a wide variety

---

[5]"Census Shows Rise in Number of Small Farms," The New York Times, September 4, 1984, sec. 1, p. 17.

of social and cultural services. Further, because the "new rurals" have brought with them expectations nurtured by urban living, unavoidable conflicts arise because of value systems which cannot presently be supported by existing rural infrastructures. There is deep concern, e.g., that a quick "patching-up" of the support systems in rural communities may simply not be sufficient to meet these new needs and that a complete reworking might be necessary. Typical examples for consideration are existing bridges and roads which can no longer support the weight of modern construction vehicles, or the lack of public water service in 60% of America's unincorporated rural areas.[6] While the dichotomy of rural and urban is closing, politically and culturally, nonmetropolitan America continues to endure the proverbial back seat in relation to its economic base, health support, social services, educational institutions, etc. In relation to health services, for instance, while most rural Americans today have access to hospital facilities, few enjoy the specialized medical resources that are located in metropolitan areas.

No greater disparity exists between rural and urban America, however, than when access to information is considered. In many ways, the information needs of rural Americans are similar to those of their urban counterparts. The differences, however, are created by the distances separating both human and physical resources in the rural countryside. Most urbanites have entree to a literal cornucopia of information resources--libraries, museums,

---

[6]Reid and Sullivan, Rural Infrastructure..., p. 10.

data centers, specialized agencies of various types, etc., all within the mass transportation radius of a city. Rural Americans, however, must travel an average of over 50 miles to reach a city of 25,000 people, where some of these information services may be available.[7]

It is difficult to adequately express what comprises the "information spectrum" of our society. As benchmarks, however, consider the fact that over 40,000 books in English are being published in the United States annually, millions of documents and other resources are produced by governmental agencies, approximately 100,000 periodicals are published worldwide, and as many as 20,000 programs for microcomputers have been marketed within the last three years. Added to these products are all of the countless items already residing in libraries and other repositories. Without the need for hyperbole, our information economy consists of billions of things and billions of dollars. "Information" is so pervasive a concept that John Naisbitt (of Megatrends fame) has concluded that information, along with people, constitute the necessary elements for the survival of business in the United States.[8]

Rural America has always been faced with the problems of collecting, organizing, and disseminating information. Institutionally, these challenges have been assumed by a variety of agencies--Cooperative Extension Service, public libraries, data processing professionals,

---

[7]Reference Service in Rural Public Libraries. (Clarion, Pennsylvania: Clarion State College, School of Library Science, Center for the Study of Rural Librarianship, 1982), p. 25.
[8]John Naisbitt, "Reinventing the American Corporation," The New York Times, December 23, 1984, sec. 3, p. 2.

local and state governments, public and private agencies, etc. The difficulty has been, however, that these helping entities have frequently provided their services in isolation of each other even though their goals have been similar. For example, Extension's job is education and the transmittal of practical information produced by research entities to the public. In like manner, the historical role of the public library has been to provide for the educational, informational, and recreational needs of its clientele. Parenthetically, it should be noted that the presence of Cooperative Extension and the local community library provide the first-line of informational support in rural America. The entrepreneurial private sector also contributes to life-long learning and informational support, e.g., through the stimulation of new ideas and the delivery of services. The challenge now becomes one of welding those organizations, presently supporting the "info-structure" of rural America, into a cooperative thrust. Overwhelming amounts of information, along with their relative costs, the inability of coping individually, local governmental autonomy, a sense of the new federalism, etc., make this cooperative thrust an imperative of the largest magnitude. Literally, it is a matter of survival.

Lest it be misunderstood, while the cooperative paradigm suggested above is necessary to deal with the phenomenon of information on a philosophical level, it is the challenge of accessing, analyzing, and disseminating information for the solution of practical problems that is the most immediate concern in rural America.

The following is a list, not in priority order, suggesting

some of these informational imperatives:

First, to meet the concerns of local part-time governmental officials, who need increasing amounts of technical data to administer rural areas--at a time when greater reliance is placed on local sources of revenues;

Second, for the needs of rural planners, who are faced with alternative choices among the facilities and technologies needed to support and/or rebuild community services;

Third, to assist "the transformation of the rural economy from its agrarian and extractive past to its current dependence on manufacturing and service industries, and its integration into national and international markets...."[9]

Fourth, for the private sector, that must respond to the population growth in rural areas by helping to create new sources of employment;

Fifth, for local and state governments that are cognizant of needed demands in developing new job training partnerships;

Sixth, for the individuals and agencies responsible for the future of the rural family, which is diminishing in size and getting older;

Seventh, to provide information to those responsible for communications and telecommunications policy;

Eighth, to assist in the "development of efficient ways of disseminating agriculture-related information to consumers and government officials to enhance their understanding of agriculture

---

[9]Kenneth L. Deavers and David L. Brown, "A New Agenda for Rural Policy in the 1980's." Rural Development Perspectives Volume 1, Issue 1 (October, 1984), p. 39.

and policy needs;"[10]

Ninth, to help in the development of agribusiness near the place of farm production through the education of industrial and business managers;[11]

Tenth, to help educate farmers on national and international policies and issues affecting agricultural production and marketing; and,

Eleventh, to enable those individuals living in rural America to enjoy a better life because of access to timely information.

Bernard Vavrek

Clarion University of Pennsylvania

---

[10] U.S. Department of Agriculture, Cooperative Extension Service and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. Extension in the 80s: A Perspective for the Future of the Cooperative Extension Service. (Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin, Cooperative Extension Service, 1983), p. 9.

[11] Ibid., p. 9.

II. COOPERATIVE NATIONAL PLANNING TO MEET RURAL INFORMATION NEEDS

In 1981, Mr. Gerald J. Sophar, former Executive Officer of the National Agriculture Library, was transferred through a loan agreement to the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science to help augment a continuation of NAL's rural information services outreach program. NCLIS, by law, has a major responsibility in providing for the library and information needs of rural America. As a consequence of its involvement, NCLIS, under the direction of Dr. Toni Carbo Bearman, sponsored a Joint Congressional Hearing at the meeting of the World Future Society on July 21, 1982, in Washington, D. C.[12] Senator Mark Andrews (Rep.) of North Dakota, and Representative George E. Brown Jr. (Dem.) of California, co-chaired the Hearing, which attracted over 350 individuals. In addition, more than 1500 people also visited a NCLIS sponsored exhibit of a model rural learning/information center.

Through the published hearing, the Secretary of Agriculture stated his support with the following comment:

> The Department of Agriculture will continue to cooperate with the Commission [National Commission on Libraries and Information Science] in furthering the common goal of providing good information to our agricultural and rural communities... The Commission can count on the full cooperation of the Department of Agriculture.[13]

---

[12] U. S. Department of Agriculture and U. S. National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, Joint Congressional Hearing on the Changing Information Needs of Rural America: The Role of Libraries and Information Technology, July 21, 1982. (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1984.)

[13] Joint Congressional Hearing...., p. ii.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Early in 1983, the rural information services outreach [illegible] initiated at NAL and continued as a function of [illegible]CIS evolved into and was renamed the National Rural Library and Information Services Development Program (NRLISDP.) Further, this entity acquired support at the highest departmental level, i.e., at the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture. This was a particularly important development in that NCLIS is not an operating agency and, therefore, could not continue NRLISDP on a permanent basis.

In October, 1983, during the 46th Annual Meeting of the American Society for Information Science, in Washington, D. C., Mr. Raymond Lett, Executive Assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture, chaired a program dealing with the use of information to encourage innovation and increase productivity in rural areas of the United States. The session was co-sponsored by NCLIS and USDA. Joining Mr. Lett on the platform were Ms. Elinor Hashim, Chairman of the Commission; Ms. Laura Chodos, Regent of the University of the State of New York and Chairman of the White House Conference on Libraries and Information Services Task Force; and, Dr. Glenn Wilde, Assistant Dean, Extension, College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences, Utah State University and leader of the Intermountain Community Learning and Information Services Project (ICLIS.)

Although the topic discussed at the above mentioned session was interesting, it was no more significant than those matters considered at similar sessions during other meetings of the Information Science, Library, and Cooperative Extension communities. However, in another sense, this session had an historical significance

associated with it. For the first time leaders of these communities shared a platform to state that the need to improve the delivery of information services to rural America was national in scope and to pledge a response to this need.

Earlier in the same year, USDA and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC) issued a joint report, "Extension in the 80s." This report described a number of Extension's goals in furthering its classical mission of disseminating and diffusing information and knowledge (particularly that which is research generated) to communities, universities, and individuals. The report states that Extension will focus on six major program goals in conducting its mission. One of these is "To cooperate with other agencies and institutions of local, state, and federal governments, and the private sector in the development and conduct of informational programs for the public." Clearly, Cooperative Extension has reinforced its commitment to the future of rural America.

During the last month of 1983, meetings began between Elinor M. Hashim, Chairman of NCLIS and Mary Nell Greenwood, Administrator of USDA's Extension Service, to consider the development of a permanent board which would focus national attention on the information needs of the rural citizenry. Because of these meetings and earlier ones that took place between Gerald J. Sophar and Ernie Matthias, a Special Assistant in the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture, a National Advisory Board on Rural Information Needs (NABRIN) Planning Committee was formed. As evidence of its commitment

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

to this activity, the Department of Agriculture assigned five individuals to the NABRIN Planning Committee representing: the Office of the Secretary; the Rural Development Office; the National Agriculture Library; the Extension Service; and the Extension Committee on Organization and Policy.

The NABRIN Planning Committee now has fifteen members, one of whom is the Director of the National Technical Information Service. Others members of the Committee represent a cross section of the public and private sector who are involved in information access and use.[14] The Planning Committee met for the first time on January 21, 1984, and then throughout the remainder of the year. Resulting from its deliberations is a modus operandi consisting of a set of goals and objectives.

---

[14]The Committee's roster may be found as Section IV in this document.

CHARTER OF THE NATIONAL ADVISORY BOARD ON RURAL INFORMATION NEEDS

A. Establishment

In accordance with USDA Departmental Regulation, the Secretary of Agriculture has established the National Advisory Board on Rural Information Needs, chartered under the Federal Advisory Committee Act of 1972 (Public Law 92-463), to advise and counsel the Secretary on subjects relating to rural information matters.

B. Objectives and Duties

1. The objectives of the Board are to advise and assist the Secretary of Agriculture, and other Federal Agencies and officials referred to in USDA Departmental Regulations with actions designed to carry out the assignments set out herein and particularly those pertaining to rural development set forth in Section 2204 and 2211 (b), Chapter 55, of the U. S. Code of Federal Regulations.

2. The Board shall focus national attention on the essential information needs for rural America, and will examine these needs in order to develop policies, strategies, and action programs that will enable rural citizens, governments, public and private entities to access, offer, and utilize appropriate information based services.

3. Specifically, the Board shall:

a. Identify the needs for information services in rural communities and determine the private and public benefits and value of such services.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

b. Evaluate existing information services and consider appropriate revision, alternatives, and/or extensions necessary to provide the information services required.

c. Develop a plan for implementing cost effective information based services that assure the needs of rural communities are met, and seek its implementation.

d. Enlist the cooperation and support of: federal, state, and local agencies; private firms; foundation; organizations and institutions; other interested or affected entities.

4. The Board shall submit an annual report to the Secretary which will include a summary of the Committee's efforts during the year, plans for the next two years, and recommendations prepared by the Board. It shall also submit the annual report to the Chairman of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (NCLIS).

5. The Board shall serve on a continuing basis within the limitations of the law.

6. The Board functions solely as an advisory body in compliance with the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

C. Members and Chairperson

1. The Board shall consist of not more than twenty members appointed by the Secretary, assuring a valuable, balanced, and effective representation from the public and private sectors as follows:

a. From the private sector, persons recognized as experienced and skilled in disciplines as follows, two each from: agribusiness; information services; communications/technology. One each from: the media; financial services; marketing; and one other as appropriate.

b. From the public sector, persons recognized as experienced and skilled as follows, one each from: Republican Congress; Democratic Congress; Land Grant University/1890 College; state/county library; NCLIS; three persons from USDA, including Cooperative Extension and the National Agricultural Library; sociology educator; and one other as appropriate.

2. A non-member, who is an employee of the Department of Agriculture serving at the pleasure of the Secretary, designated Board/Committee Management Officer in accordance with Section 8. (b) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

3. The Chairperson shall be elected by the Board members; the Vice-Chairperson shall be the NCLIS representative and they shall fulfill the duties specified by the Federal Advisory Committee Act and/or other appropriate law or regulation. These persons shall serve no more than a two-year term in their respective offices.

4. The terms of the initial Board members shall expire (designated by the Secretary at the time of the appointment) as follows: five at the end of the first year; five at the end of the second year; five at the end of the third year; and five at the end of the fourth year. All persons appointed after the initial appointments shall serve a four-year term, except that any person appointed to fill an unexpired term vacancy, shall be appointed only for that term of the vacancy.

5. No person shall serve as a member of the Board for more than two terms.

6. Selection and appointment to the committee shall be made without regard to race, color, national origin, religion, handicap or sex.

7. Any Board member who is absent from four consecutive Board meetings will automatically terminate his or her membership.

D. Board Meetings

The Board meets at least every three months at the call of the Chairperson, unless the Chairperson determines, in consultation with the other Board members, that such a meeting is not necessary to achieve the purposes of the Charter. Meetings and the work of the Board shall be subject to the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act and USDA Departmental Regulations.

E. Recommendations to the Secretary

From time to time, the Board shall make written findings and recommendations to the Secretary. The Secretary shall report to the Board the disposition of the findings and recommendations, including the rationale for approval or disapproval of the Board's

recommendations. The Secretary shall make such reports no later than one hundred and twenty days after the written submission of the recommendations.

F. Reports

Within ninety days after the close of each calendar year, the Board shall submit an Annual Report to the Secretary, with copies to other designated offices. This report shall outline the activities undertaken by the Board since it inception, or last Annual Report, and shall include any findings and recommendations made to the Secretary during the reporting period. This Annual Report shall also provide the Secretary with the Board's plans and projected activities for the succeeding two years.

G. Support Services

The Secretary shall provide such staff personnel, clerical assistance, services, materials, and office space required to assist the Board in carrying out its duties.

H. Compensation and Operating Costs

The members of the Board shall serve without compensation, if not otherwise officers or employees of the United States Government, except that they shall, while away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services or duties to the Board, be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same manner as persons employed intermittently in the Government service are allowed expenses under sections 5701 through 5707 of Title 5, United States Code.

Annual operating costs are estimated at $120,000 and one staff year.

Support for the Committee will be provided by: (support agency to be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture).

IV. MEMBERS: NABRIN PLANNING BOARD

Gerald J. Sophar, Chairperson, Administrator For Federal/Local Community Information Programs, National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, Washington, D. C.

Joseph Caponio, Director, National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia.

Barry Carr, Senior Analyst, Environment and National Resources Policy Division, Congressional Research Service, The Library of Congress, Washington, D. C.

Daniel H. Carter, Vice-President, Strategic Business Services, Walter Ulrich Consulting, Houston, Texas.

Clarence L. Coffindafer, State Librarian, South Dakota Library and Archives, Pierre, South Dakota.

Howard Diesslin, Associate Director, Extension, Food and Agriculture, National Association State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC), Washington, D. C.

Ansel W. Doll, General Manager, Pioneer Public TV, KWCM, Appleton, Minnesota.

Robyn Frank, Chief, Food and Nutrition Information Center, National Agricultural Library, Beltsville, Maryland.

David Holder, Program Leader, Extension Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

Melvin Josephs, Associate Director, Office of Program and Product Management, National Technical Information Service,Springfield,VA.

Ernie Matthias, Vice-Chairperson, Special Assistant to the Assistant Secretary for Administration, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

George A. Sands, Jr., Administrator, Caroline County Public Library, Denton, Maryland.

Neil Storms, Rural Policy Coordination Officer, Office of Rural Development Policy, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington,D.C.

Bernard Vavrek, Coordinator, Center for the Study of Rural Librarianship, College of Library Science, Clarion University of Pennsylvania, Clarion, Pennsylvania.

Margaret Warden, Commissioner, National Commission on Libraries and Information Science; Member, Montana State Advisory Council for Libraries, Great Falls, Montana.

MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

The Commission is composed of the Librarian of Congress and fourteen Members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Commissioners' terms expire on July 19 of the year indicated in parentheses.

Elinor M. Hashim (1986)

Bessie Boehm Moore (1988)

Helmut Alpers (1984)

Gordon Ambach (1985)

Patricia Barbour (1989)

Charles Benton (1985)

Daniel J. Boorstin*

Daniel H. Carter (1990)

Daniel W. Casey (1989)

Carlos A. Cuadra (1984)

Wanda L. Forbes (1989)

Paulette H. Holahan (1985)

John E. Juergensmeyer (1987)

Byron Leeds (1986)

Jerald C. Newman (1987)

Margaret Phelan (1989)

Margaret S. Warden (1984)

William J. Welsh

Julia Li Wu (1987)

*William J. Welsh, Deputy Librarian, serves for Dr. Boorstin

RESOLUTION

Be it resolved

That a study and planning committee be convened by the Commission to examine and evaluate the concept of a National Advisory Board on Rural Information Needs (NABRIN), determine if there is a need for such a board and what its purpose would be, provided the U.S. Department of Agriculture supports this effort, and

That the Planning Committee be charged to prepare a report by June 30, 1984, if at all possible, or as soon thereafter as it can, on a NABRIN"s purpose, functions, alternative institutional locations, possible membership formats and organizational structures, and funding mechanisms.

Authority and Responsibility
of the
National Commission on Libraries
and Information Science

APPENDIX

Public Law 91-345
91st Congress, S. 1519
July 20, 1970
As amended by Public Law 93-29, Section 802, May 3, 1973
An Act

To establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Commission on Libraries and Information Science Act".

STATEMENT OF POLICY

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby affirms that library and information services adequate to meet the needs of the people of the United States are essential to achieve national goals and to utilize most effectively the Nation's educational resources and that the Federal Government will cooperate with State and local governments and public and private agencies in assuring optimum provision of such services.

COMMISSION ESTABLISHED

SEC. 3. (a) . . . . (b) . . . .

CONTRIBUTIONS

SEC. 4. . . . .

FUNCTIONS

SEC. 5. (a) The Commission shall have the primary responsibility for developing or recommending overall plans for, and advising the appropriate governments and agencies on, the policy set forth in section2. In carrying out that responsibility, the Commission shall---

(1) advise the President and the Congress on the implementation of national policy by such statements, presentations, and reports as it deems appropriate;

(2) conduct studies, surveys, and analyses of the library and informational needs of the Nation, including the special library and informational needs of rural areas, of economically,

socially, or culturally deprived persons, and of elderly persons, and the means by which these needs may be met through information centers, through the libraries of elementary and secondary schools and institutions of higher education, and through public, research, special, and other types of libraries;

(3) appraise the adequacies and deficiencies of current library and information resources and services and evaluate the effectiveness of current library and information science programs;

(4) develop overall plans for meeting national library and informational needs and for the coordination of activities at the Federal, State, and local levels, taking into consideration all of the library and informational resources of the Nation to meet those needs;

(5) be authorized to advise Federal, State, local, and private agencies regarding library and information sciences;

(6) promote research and development activities which will extend and improve the Nation's library and information-handling capability as essential links in the national communications networks;

(7) submit to the President and the Congress (not later than January 31 of each year) a report on its activities during the preceding fiscal year; and

(8) make and publish such additional reports as it deems to be necessary, including, but not limited to, reports of consultants, transcripts of testimony, summary reports, and reports of other Commission findings, studies, and recommendations.

(b) The Commission is authorized to contract with Federal agencies and other public and private agencies to carry out any of its functions under subsection (a) and to publish and disseminate such reports, findings, studies, and records as it deems appropriate.

(c) The Commission is further authorized to conduct such hearings at such times and places as it deems appropriate for carrying out the purposes of this Act.

(d) The heads of all Federal agencies are, to the extent not prohibited by law, directed to cooperate with the Commission in carrying out the purposes of this Act.

MEMBERSHIP

SEC. 6. (a) . . . .

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 7. . . . .

CHAPTER 55--DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Sec.
2204b. . . . .

§2201. Establishment of Department

There shall be at the seat of government a Department of Agriculture, the general design and duties of which shall be to acquire and to diffuse among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with agriculture, rural development, aquaculture, and human nutrition, in the most general and comprehensive sense of those terms, and to procure, propagate, and distribute among the people new and valuable seeds and plants.
As amended . . . .

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2 OF 1953

. . . .

§ 2202. Executive Department; Secretary . . . .

§ 2204. General duties of Secretary; advisory functions; research and development

(a) The Secretary of Agriculture shall procure and preserve all information concerning agriculture, rural development, aquaculture, and human nutrition which he can obtain by means of books and correspondence, and by practical and scientific experiments, accurate records of which experiments shall be kept in his office, by the collection of statistics, and by any other appropriate means within his power; . . . . and he shall advise the President, other members of his Cabinet, and the Congress on policies and programs designed to improve the quality of life for people living in the rural and nonmetropolitan regions of the Nation.

(b) The Secretary is authorized to initiate or expand research and development efforts related to solution of problems of rural water supply, rural sewage and solid waste management, rural housing, rural industrialization, and technology appropriate to small- and moderate-sized family farming operations, and any other problem that the Secretary may determine has an effect upon the economic development or the quality of life in rural areas.
As amended . . . .

§ 2204a. Rural development; utilization of non-Federal offices; location of field units; interchange of personnel and facilities

The Secretary of Agriculture shall utilize to the maximum extent practicable State, regional, district, county, local, or other Department of Agriculture offices to enhance rural development and shall to the maximum extent practicable provide directly, or, in the case of agencies outside of the Department of Agriculture, through arrangements with the heads of such agencies for---

(1) the location of all field units of the Federal Government concerned with rural development in the appropriate Department of Agriculture offices covering the geographical areas most similar to those covered by such field units, and

(2) the interchange of personnel and facilities in each such office to the extent necessary or desirable to achieve the most efficient utilization of such personnel and facilities and provide the most effective assistance in the development of rural areas in accordance with State rural development plans.

As amended . . . .

§ 2204b. Rural development policy--Coordination of nationwide rural development program using services of executive branch departments and agencies and State and local governments

(a) The Secretary of Agriculture shall provide leadership within the executive branch for, and shall assume responsibility for coordinating, a nationwide rural development program using the services of executive branch departments and agencies, including, but not limited to, the agencies, bureaus, offices, and services of the Department of Agriculture, in coordination with rural development programs of State and local governments.

Policy development; systematic review of Federal programs; access to information; development of process to receive and assess needs, goals, etc.; cooperative efforts with Federal departments and agencies; public hearings and comments

(b)(1) The Secretary shall conduct a systematic review of Federal programs affecting rural areas to (A) determine whether such areas are benefiting from such programs in an equitable proportion to the benefits received by urban areas and (B) identify any factors that may restrict accessibility to such programs in rural areas or limit participation in such programs.

(2) Subject to the Privacy Act of 1974, the Secretary may secure directly from any Federal department or agency information necessary to carry out the Secretary's duties under this section. Upon request of the Secretary under this paragraph, the head of any such Federal department or agency shall furnish such information to the Secretary.

(3) The Secretary shall develop a process through which multistate, State, substate, and local rural development needs, goals, objectives, plans, and recommendations can be received and assessed on a continuing basis. Such process may include the use of those rural development experts, advisors, and consultants that the Secretary deems appropriate, as well as the establishment of temporary advisory committees under the terms of the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

(4) **The Secretary may undertake cooperative efforts with other Federal departments and agencies to improve the coordination and effectiveness of Federal programs, services, and actions affecting rural areas. The Secretary may request the heads of other Federal departments and agencies to participate in any working groups that the Secretary deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.**

(5) The Secretary may hold public hearings and receive comments on any matter that the Secretary determines may have a significant impact on rural development or the economic development of rural communities.

Rural development strategy and annual updates; preparation and scope; purposes; time for updates; public hearings and suggestions and recommendations; transmittal to Congressional committees; analysis of budgetary considerations and factors; evaluation and recommendations regarding implementation and revisions

(c)(1) The Secretary **shall prepare a comprehensive rural development strategy based on the needs, goals, objectives, plans,** and recommendations of local communities, substate areas, States, and multistate regions, which is designed to--

(A) **maximize the effectiveness, increase the responsiveness,** and **improve the delivery of Federal programs to rural areas;**

(B) increase the **coordination of Federal programs** with the development needs, objectives, and resources of local communities, substate areas, States and multistate regions; and

(C) **achieve the most effective combinations** of Federal, State, and **local resources to meet the needs of rural areas** for orderly **growth and development.**

(2) The rural development strategy shall take into account the need to--

(A) improve the economic well-being of all rural residents and alleviate the problems of low income, elderly, minority, and otherwise disadvantaged rural residents;

(B) improve the business and employment opportunities, occupational training and employment services, health care services, educational opportunities, energy utilization and availability, housing, transportation, community services, community facilities, water supplies, sewage and solid waste management systems, credit availability, and accessibility to and delivery of private and public financial resources in the maintenance and creation of jobs in rural areas;

(C) improve State and local government management capabilities, institutions, and programs related to rural development and expand educational and training opportunities for State and local officials, particularly in small rural communities;

(D) strengthen the family farm system; and

(E) maintain and protect the environment and natural resources of rural areas.

(3) The rural . . . .

(4) The Secretary . . . .

(5) The rural . . . .

(6) The rural . . . .

Strategy implementation; goals

(d) The Secretary shall ensure the effective implementation of the rural development strategy and maximize coordination of Federal programs affecting rural areas through a systematic effort to---

(1) improve communication and encourage cooperation among Federal departments and agencies in the administration of rural development programs;

(2) eliminate conflicts, duplication, and gaps in program coverage, and resolve contradictions and inconsistencies in the objectives, administration, and effects of rural development programs;

(3) facilitate the sharing or common location of field offices of Federal agencies administering similar or complementary programs and unification of delivery systems, where feasible, to maximize convenience and accessibility of such agencies and programs to rural residents;

(4) facilitate and expedite joint funding of rural projects through Federal programs;

(5) correct administrative problems in Federal programs that delay or hinder the effective delivery of services, assistance, or benefits to rural areas; and

(6) simplify, standardize, and reduce the complexity of applications, reports, and other forms required under Federal rural development programs.

Pub.L. 92-419 . . . .

§ 2210. Deputy Secretary of Agriculture; appointment . . . .

§ 2211. Same; duties . . . .

§ 2211a. Under Secretary of Agriculture for International Affairs and Commodity Programs; appointment . . . .

§ 2211b. Under Secretary of Agriculture for Small Community and Rural Development; appointment, etc. . . . .

§ 2212b. Additional Assistant Secretary of Agriculture; appointment, duties and compensation . . . .